

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 28 and 32 are requested to be cancelled.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13 14, 15, 20, 21 and 23-27 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-15, 18-21, 23-27 and 30 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-15, 18-21, 23-28, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed toward non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-15, 18-21 and 23 are directed to an abstract idea that does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. Further, the Examiner states that claims 24-27 are intangibly embodied.

In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, 14, 21 and 23 to recite a method for filtering, correlating or consolidating one or more received events, including correlating repeated events, correlating the failure of a portal service with the performance of a network, correlating a database failure and a database restoration event, correlating multiple instances of the same event and managing and correlating server failures. In addition, independent claim 24 has been amended to recite a computer implemented system embodied in a computer readable medium. Applicant submits that the claims fully recite, to the extent required, how the outputs of the method are dependent upon the inputs, and demonstrates how the results are substantially repeatable. Further, claim 24 is now tangibly embodied.

Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-15, 18-21, 23-27 and 30 are statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 28 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicant cancels claims 28 and 32. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-15, 18-21, 23-28, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,341 (“Vijayan”) and in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0181685 (“Marwaha”). In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicant amends claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13 14, 15, 20, 21 and 23-27 and cancels claims 28 and 32. Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-15, 18-21, 23-27 and 30 are now allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant relies on M.P.E.P. § 2143, which states that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation in the prior art to modify the reference. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Vijayan nor Marwaha, alone or in combination, discloses each and every element of independent claims 1, 7, 14, 21, 23 and 24 as amended.

Independent claims 1, 7, 14, 21, 23 and 24 are directed toward a system and method for managing different types of events in a distributed computing system. As stated above, independent claims 1, 7, 14, 21, 23 and 24 recite a method and system for filtering, correlating or consolidating one or more received events, including correlating the failure of a portal service with the performance of the network, correlating a database failure and a database restoration event, correlating multiple instances of the same event and managing and correlating server failures.

Vijayan does not disclose, teach or suggest a method for receiving and correlating subsequent events in order to output a threshold event to the user as claimed in claim 1. In addition, Vijayan does not disclose, teach or suggest a method for receiving at least one event specifying a type of server failure, correlating the server failure event with a subsequent event and outputting to the user either a server restoration or server failure event as claimed in claim 7. Further, Vijayan does not disclose, teach or suggest a method for receiving an event related to the performance of a network and correlating the network performance event with an event indicating a portal service failure to output an event identifying the cause of the portal service failure event as claimed in claim 14. Additionally, Vijayan does not disclose, teach or suggest a method for managing the receipt of events indicating a database failure or the restoration of a database and outputting the status of the database to a user as claimed in claim 21. Further, Vijayan does not disclose, teach or suggest a method for managing the receipt of events of the same type by discarding subsequent events of the same type and outputting a first event and an event indicating the number of subsequent events discarded to a user as claimed in claim 23. Moreover, Vijayan does not disclose, teach or suggest a system for managing received events having a central event system, including a rules database containing actions for filtering, correlating or consolidating one or more received events as claimed in claim 24.

Instead, Vijayan discloses a method for monitoring faults within a computer network. Specifically, Vijayan is directed toward integrating changes into a Fault Management System (Col. 1, lines 42-45.) Accordingly, the device disclosed in Vijayan requires that it receive event information solely in the form of an event, host, fault management point (FMP) triplet. (Col. 4, lines 45-49.) The device disclosed in Vijayan is hardwired to accept and process a single event, host, fault management point (FMP) triplet. Thus, in contrast to the claimed invention, the application of the device disclosed in Vijayan is limited to fault management based on the receipt of events in the format of FMP triplets.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Vijayan does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 7, 14, 21, 23 and 24. Further, Marwaha fails to cure the deficiencies of Vijayan. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn. In addition, claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 25-27 and 30 depend from one of claims 1, 7, 14 and 24 and should be allowed at least for the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance.
Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date NOV 09 2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer No.: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By W. Keith for Reg No. 57394
for William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874